IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA
AT CHARLESTON

\_\_\_\_X

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, : Criminal Action

Plaintiff, : No. 2:12-cr-00207

v. :

: Date: November 15, 2017

PATRICK WARREN NAPIER,

Defendant. :

TRANSCRIPT OF SUPERVISED RELEASE REVOCATION HEARING
HELD BEFORE THE HONORABLE THOMAS E. JOHNSTON, CHIEF JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
IN CHARLESTON, WEST VIRGINIA

## APPEARANCES:

For the Government: AUSA JOSHUA C. HANKS

U.S. Attorney's Office

P.O. Box 1713

Charleston, WV 25326-1713

For the Defendant: GREGORY J. CAMPBELL, ESQ.

Campbell Law Offices

Suite 300

105 Capitol Street Charleston, WV 25301

Probation Officer: Jeff Bella

Court Reporter: Ayme Cochran, RMR, CRR

Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript produced by computer.

PROCEEDINGS had before The Honorable Thomas E.
Johnston, Judge, United States District Court, Southern
District of West Virginia, in Charleston, West Virginia, on
November 15, 2017, at 2:00 p.m., as follows:
COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: The matter before the
Court is the United States of America versus Patrick Napier,
criminal action number 2:12-cr-00207-3, scheduled for a
revocation hearing.
THE COURT: Good afternoon. Will counsel please
note their appearances?
MR. HANKS: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Josh
Hanks on behalf of the United States.
MR. CAMPBELL: Gregory Campbell on behalf of the
defendant, Patrick Napier, who is present here in the
courtroom, Your Honor.
THE COURT: Good afternoon. Is it Napier or
Napier?
THE DEFENDANT: Napier.
THE COURT: Alright. Mr. Napier, I will ask the
deputy clerk to administer an oath to you at this time.
COURTROOM DEPUTY CLERK: Please raise your right
hand.
PATRICK WARREN NAPIER, DEFENDANT, SWORN
THE COURT: You may be seated.
Mr. Napier, do you understand that you are now under

oath and, if you answer any of my questions or otherwise testify falsely, your answers may later be used against you in another prosecution for perjury or for making a false statement?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I note for the record that the defendant's probation officer, Mr. Jeffrey Bella, is also present in the courtroom.

On November 4th, 2013, Mr. Napier was sentenced to a

On November 4th, 2013, Mr. Napier was sentenced to a term of 48 months imprisonment, followed by a three-year term of supervised release for his conviction of conspiracy to distribute Oxycodone in violation of 21 U. S. C. Section 846. Mr. Napier was released from custody on June 22nd, 2016 and began serving his term of supervised release on that date.

On September 14th, 2017, Mr. Napier's probation officer filed a Petition for a Warrant or Summons for Offender Under Supervision against Mr. Napier charging him with violating certain conditions of his supervised release. The violations are alleged in the petition.

Further, on October 5th, 2017, Mr. Napier's probation officer filed an amendment to the petition against Mr. Napier charging him with violating additional conditions of his supervised release and those additional violations are alleged in that amendment.

```
1
            Mr. Napier, have you received a written copy of the
2
       petition and the amendment setting forth the alleged
 3
       violations of your term of supervised release?
 4
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
 5
                 THE COURT: And have you read the alleged
       violations?
 6
 7
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
                 THE COURT: And have you reviewed them with your
 8
 9
       attorney?
10
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
11
                 THE COURT: And do you understand the allegations
12
       set forth in the petition and the amendment?
13
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
14
                 THE COURT: You don't need to stand unless I
15
       indicate otherwise.
16
                MR. CAMPBELL: I just -- I'm just not used to it,
17
       Judge. I'm sorry.
18
                 THE COURT: I'm just looking for some answers
19
       here.
20
                 THE DEFENDANT: Sorry about that.
21
                 THE COURT: Let me ask that last question again.
22
       Do you understand the allegations set forth in the petition
23
       and the amendment?
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, I do.
24
25
                 THE COURT: Alright. And, Mr. Campbell, has the
```

Ayme A. Cochran, RMR, CRR (304) 347-3128

```
1
       evidence against Mr. Napier been disclosed?
 2
                 MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, sir, it has.
 3
                 THE COURT: Mr. Napier, do you understand that if
 4
       I determine that you have violated the terms and conditions
 5
       of your supervised release, under the United States
 6
       quidelines, I may revoke, extend or modify your term of
 7
       supervised release?
 8
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir, I do.
 9
                 THE COURT: And do you admit or deny the
10
       allegations contained in the petition and the amendment?
11
                 THE DEFENDANT: I do not deny them.
12
                 THE COURT: Well --
13
                 THE DEFENDANT: I admit.
14
                 THE COURT: You admit them?
15
                 THE DEFENDANT:
                                 Yeah.
16
                 THE COURT: All of them?
17
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yeah.
18
                 THE COURT: Yes?
19
                 THE DEFENDANT: Yes, sir.
20
                 THE COURT: Alright. Very well.
21
            Alright. Now, at this point, Mr. Campbell, I
22
       understand you have an alternative that you would like to
23
       propose?
24
                 MR. CAMPBELL: Your Honor, I would like to -- the
25
       Court to hold the petition in abeyance, continue the matter
```

Ayme A. Cochran, RMR, CRR (304) 347-3128

generally. I have -- not me. Mr. Bella has basically secured a bed at Recovery Point in Huntington for the long-term program. I provided Mr. Yoches with an outline of that program.

THE COURT: I'm very familiar with Recovery Point.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Judge, I was not and it took me a little bit to get up to speed. I appreciate the Court continuing this because I just hadn't had a case where it came up. I would like to see Patrick get into it, get into the program. He expressed to me, Judge, earlier on one of my jail visits with him that he would like to get into one of the programs.

I -- Judge, I made a mistake. I -- there was -- in the petition, there's a mention that a weapon was found in the home where -- or one of the houses where Mr. Napier was. It was inoperable, I believe, but still, in the guidelines, it indicated that perhaps he wouldn't be eligible for anything other than incarceration.

And then, at some point, it dawns on me that the guidelines are no longer mandatory. I started checking into alternative sentences or activities that could be imposed.

I asked Mr. Napier, and he expressed to me that he would like to get in a long-term program, as opposed to a short-term program.

He was hoping that he might be able to get something in

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Ohio. His mother, Ms. Patierno, Cathy Patierno, P-a-t-i-e-r-n-o, was -- lives in Ohio, was seeking to find places for him. Judge, she's highly motivated. She has provided a lot of support for him. Mr. Napier is unlike most of my clients. He has a great support group and people willing to help him. We were unable to find anything in Ohio, but we -through Mr. Bella, we were able to get something at Recovery Point. He -- the letter that I received from Mr. Litz indicates that there would be a bed open today until 1:00 and tomorrow until no later than 1:00. So, my intent, like I say, is to ask the Court to hold the petition in abeyance, continue the matter generally, either order that the marshals deliver him to Recovery Point, or the Court -- Ms. Patierno and her husband have agreed to accept custody and would agree to have him to Recovery Point before noon tomorrow. I would advise Mr. Litz what the plan is and keep the Court advised through the clerk. So --THE COURT: Alright. Well, first of all, I'm very familiar with Recovery Point and I think it's a very good

THE COURT: Alright. Well, first of all, I'm very familiar with Recovery Point and I think it's a very good program. And I have sent a number of defendants to Recovery Point. I think that it has a -- in the grand scheme of things, it has a pretty good success rate. It is a very rigorous program, though, and it is one of the longer-term

programs that we have available to us.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Based on my review of the file, I think that the defendant can benefit from it.

Does the Government have any objection to that?

MR. HANKS: Your Honor, I don't think anyone would object to the defendant getting treatment. You know, I think that, in large part, I think that the defendant's conduct while on supervision is more -- you know, the Court is sort of the victim in the sense that it's a betrayal of the Court's trust. So, you know, if Your Honor believes that it's appropriate to do the treatment now rather than do revocation now and treatment later, I understand that, but I do think the conduct would warrant revocation on the front end, but at the same time, I understand that these addiction issues are very complicated and I hesitate to weigh in. I don't want to say it that way because I don't have any problem advocating a position, but I don't -- I hesitate to get in over my head and try to, you know, determine when treatment is better or not. So, all of that to say I do not object to treatment.

On the matter of holding in abeyance, the question I would have is, would the Court consider holding in abeyance sort of the first go-around, as the Court's practice is, is to sort of help someone or give them a break on the front and if there's a second revocation, that's when more

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

strenuous punishments and things are applied. I was just curious about that part of it because, if that's the case, I don't object at all to him getting treatment now, with the understanding that if we come back, it's as if it's the second time around. THE COURT: Well, that is my practice, so -- and that's what I intend to do in this case. Mr. Bella, you're on board with this because you set it up, right? PROBATION OFFICER BELLA: Yeah. Mr. Campbell asked for assistance in finding a bed, so I located a bed for him. You know, I tried to get him in treatment numerous times while he was on supervised release and just couldn't get him there. I would probably prefer the revocation first with treatment on the back end just for the amount of violations that he has. But, yes, I'm definitely open for him going to treatment. THE COURT: Alright. Well, where is the defendant currently housed? MR. CAMPBELL: South Central. THE COURT: Alright. So, here's what I'm going to do. I'm going to go ahead and hold the petition in abeyance and enter an order sending him to Recovery Point, which will include that he abide by all the rules and regulations of the facility and successfully

Ayme A. Cochran, RMR, CRR (304) 347-3128

complete the program.

I -- he's already been in custody for almost two months and his guidelines are fairly low. So, I don't see any benefit to revoking him at this point, as opposed to just holding it in abeyance and modifying his supervised release conditions. That also allows me to hold this whole thing over his head. So -- and with the following warning:

Mr. Napier, what Mr. Hanks hinted at is correct. This is not an unusual result on a first revocation before me, especially when it's obvious that the defendant has a drug problem. So, a short period of incarceration, the opportunity for inpatient drug treatment, or some combination of the two is the typical result.

On a second petition, if you're back before me again either because you've gotten thrown out of Recovery Point or because you've otherwise violated the terms and conditions of your supervised release, in all likelihood, if I find that you violated again, I'm going to give you the statutory maximum, which I think in this case is --

MR. CAMPBELL: 24 months.

THE COURT: I believe it's 24 months, yeah. So, I provide that information as fair warning and, also, as an additional incentive for you to take seriously the Recovery Point program and, going forward, the conditions of supervised release under which you have to live.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
And -- but based on your history, it appears to me that
this program could be beneficial for you. It's not an easy
program. It's a tough program. But that's one of the
reasons I can I think it succeeds where other others may
not. It's a rigorous program.
     So, I encourage you to take it seriously, take
advantage of it, use as an opportunity to put your addiction
issues behind you and move forward with your life.
     I also hope you'll take advantage of it because, if you
don't, you're taking up bed space that somebody else -- in
this day and age with the opioid crisis, somebody else could
use. So, I'll go ahead and enter an order to that effect.
     I will -- they want him at Recovery Point by 1:00
tomorrow?
          MR. CAMPBELL: By no later than 1:00.
          THE COURT: By no later than 1:00? Alright.
Well, what I will do then is, I will include in the order
that he be released from custody at the South Central
Regional Jail at 10:00 a.m. to the custody -- to his mother
to be transported from South Central to Recovery Point in
Huntington without any stop or delay or detour in the
morning.
    Alright. Anything else we need to take up in this
case?
          MR. HANKS: No, Your Honor.
```

```
1
                 MR. CAMPBELL: No, Your Honor. Thank you, sir.
2
                 THE COURT: Alright. The defendant will be
 3
       remanded to the custody of the marshals pending my order and
 4
       this Court stands adjourned.
 5
           (Proceedings concluded at 2:07 p.m., November 15, 2017.)
 6
7
       CERTIFICATION:
 8
            I, Ayme A. Cochran, Official Court Reporter, certify
 9
       that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record
10
       of proceedings in the matter of United States of America,
11
       Plaintiff v. Patrick Warren Napier, Defendant, Criminal
12
       Action No. 2:12-cr-00207-3, as reported on November 15,
13
       2017.
14
15
       s/Ayme A. Cochran, RMR, CRR
                                                    June 24, 2020
16
       Ayme A. Cochran, RMR, CRR
                                                        DATE
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

Ayme A. Cochran, RMR, CRR (304) 347-3128